



Express Mail No. EV853144670US  
Docket No.: 364388075US1  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:

Kanefsky et al.

Application No.: 09/801,635

Confirmation No.: 3923

Filed: March 9, 2001

Art Unit: 2144

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
SHARING WIRELESS CONTENT

Examiner: Thanh T. Nguyen

**APPELLANT'S BRIEF**

MS Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on December 22, 2005.

The fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(f) and 1.17(p) and a two-month petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore are enclosed.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and MPEP § 1206:

04/24/2006 BABRAHA1 00000072 09801635

02 FC:1402

500.00 0P

CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	3
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	3
	A. Total Number of Claims in Application.....	3
	B. Current Status of Claims.....	3
	C. Claims On Appeal.....	4
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	4
V.	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED UPON APPEAL .....	6
VII.	ARGUMENTS.....	7
	A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).....	7
	1. Legal requirements for anticipation.....	7
	2. The Nykaken reference .....	7
	B. Nykaken fails to disclose a method for sharing content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device.....	8
	C. Claim 19: Nykanen fails to show each and every element of the claim, and cannot, therefore, anticipate the claimed invention .....	9
	D. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	11
	1. Legal requirements for obviousness .....	11
	2. The applied references.....	12
	a. The Nykanen reference	
	b. The Darago et al. reference	
	c. The Osaku reference	
	D. The Examiner has not established a <i>prima facie</i> case for obviousness.....	13
	E. Nykanen, Darago et al. and Osaku fail to disclose the sharing of content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device.....	14
	1. Claims 1-8, 15-18 and 20-42: Nykanen and Darago et al. fail to disclose a method for transmitting content from a WAP/i- mode-enabled device to another device.....	16
VIII.	CLAIMS APPENDIX .....	18
IX.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX .....	18
X.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	18
	APPENDIX A .....	19
	RELATED PROCEEDINGS .....	26

EVIDENCE APPENDIX .....	27
-------------------------	----

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is Cingular Wireless II, LLC, of Atlanta, Georgia, as a name change from previous AT&T Wireless, Inc., whose ownership was recorded August 20, 2001, at Reel/Frame: 012094/0050.

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The applicant, the applicant's legal representative, and the real party in interest are unaware of any appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

## III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

### A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 42 claims pending in the application.

### B. Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: None.
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None.
3. Claims pending: 1-42.
4. Claims allowed: None.
5. Claims rejected: 1-42.

### C. Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-42.

#### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The applicant has not filed any amendments after the last Office Action of November 15, 2005.

#### V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following chart indicates at least one instance where support for each of the independent claims may be found in the specification:

<i>Claim</i>	<i>Specific Section(s) of the Specification</i>
Claim 1	Page 7, last paragraph to page 9, third paragraph
Claim 19	Pages 7-9 (see re: claim 1) and page 12, section #5
Claim 20	Pages 7-9 (see re: claim 1) and page 18, section #9
Claim 30	Pages 7-9 (see re: claim 1) and page 20, section #13
Claim 40	Pages 7-9 (see re: claim 1) and page 18, section #10
Claim 41	Pages -9 (see re: claim 1) and sections #10 and #13
Claim 42	Pages 7-9 (see re: claim 1) and sections #10 and #13

Mobile and wireless devices employ the Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) to allow communication to and from the devices. The WAP is a secure protocol that enables a user to the real-time access of information, and is supported on many handheld device operating systems. These operating systems employ microbrowsers to provide content on the mobile device. Because the content is presented on a typically small screen of a mobile device, a special Wireless Markup Language (WML) was created to provide such

content. Devices that employ microbrowsers and support WML (or WMLScript, which is a simplified version of JavaScript) may be referred to as WAP-enabled devices.<sup>1</sup>

Alternatively, the NTT DoCoMo i-mode is another protocol that enables a user to the real-time access of information with a mobile device. The "i-mode" does not use WAP. Instead, i-mode relies on Compact HTML (cHTML), a subset version of HTML that is intended for devices with slower connection speeds, such as mobile devices. Devices that contain i-mode microbrowsers may be referred to as i-mode enabled devices.<sup>2</sup>

WAP and/or i-mode enabled devices (collectively, "WAP/i-mode-enabled devices") have not been able to easily share content with one another across a network. In many cases, a user needs to manually enter content (such as a URL) into a message, and send the message from their WAP/i-mode enabled device to another device. Manual entry can be inconvenient, as a user is not able to observe content corresponding to a URL and manually enter the content at the same time. Additionally, the user will likely need to access an additional URL (such as a URL corresponding to sending email messages) and not be able to see the displayed content of the URL the user wishes to share. In these cases, a user of a WAP/i-mode enabled device may perform many inconvenient manual steps in order to share content with another user.<sup>3</sup>

At least some of the systems and methods of the present invention provide solutions to this problem. Embodiments of the invention allow a user to transmit content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to any other device across a network. For example, a URL corresponding to content (such as a webpage) is first accessed by the WAP/i-mode-enabled device and transmitted to an application server. Then, the WAP/i-mode-enabled

---

<sup>1</sup> See Specification at page 1.

<sup>2</sup> Id., page 2.

<sup>3</sup> Id., page 3.

device transmits a destination address to the application server. The application server subsequently transmits the received URL to the destination address.<sup>4</sup>

In some embodiments, the system enables the user to bookmark an accessed URL while the user transmits the URL to the application server. In these embodiments, the user is able to save a bookmark on the user's device or transmit the bookmark to another device using the process described above.<sup>5</sup>

In some embodiments, the system may transmit a modified URL to a destination device instead of an original URL received by the application server. For example, the application server may insert content (such as advertising content) into the original URL, and transmit the original URL and inserted content as a modified URL. The system may also modify the original URL for other reasons, such as to reformat the original URL in order to properly display the content on a destination device.<sup>6</sup>

In some embodiments, the system may directly transmit the content accessed by the user to a destination device. In these embodiments, the system uses a method similar to that described above, that is, the system transmits the content to the application server. The server then transmits the content along to the destination device. The application server may also modify the content before transmitting to a destination device.<sup>7</sup>

## VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED UPON APPEAL

There are two grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. The first ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is whether claim 19 is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,661,784 to Nykanen. The second ground of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is whether claims 1-18 and 20-42 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C.

---

<sup>4</sup> Id., page 5, section #2.

<sup>5</sup> Id., page 10, section #3.

<sup>6</sup> Id., pages 12-14, section #5.

<sup>7</sup> Id., page 15, section #6.

103(a). Specifically, whether claims 1-8, 15-18, and 20-42 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,784 to Nykanen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,170,014 to Darago et al., and whether claims 9-14 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,784 to Nykanen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,170,014 to Darago et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,738 to Osaku.

## VII. ARGUMENTS

### A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

#### 1. Legal requirements for anticipation

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) provides:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless (e) the invention was described in - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The M.P.E.P. at section 2131, states that "To anticipate a claim, the element must teach every element of the claim." Specifically, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

#### 2. The Nykanen Reference

Nykanen is directed to a method for setting up a data transmission connection between two devices. The connection is formed in order to transmit information from one device to a second device. Nykanen explains that "[t]he purpose of the invention is

particularly to define a system for communication between a WAP server and a WAP client..."<sup>8</sup>

Nykanen proceeds to define the system for communication, that is, to define the retrieval of information via a communication network between a communication device and another device, as follows:

For retrieving information via the communication network, the communication device needs a WML browser and a HTTP WWW server coupled to the communication network, whereby the browser transmits a request to the selected server for retrieving the desired information, which is identified with the URL address. This information is given e.g. in the WML language which can be compared with the HTML language. After obtaining the information, it is possibly subjected to WML/HTML conversion and presented to the user by means of the application used. Usually, also the URL addresses stored in the URL register of the communication device can refer to local services, such as teleVAS functions of the device itself, or to remote services, such as information of a server in the WML form. The URL register of the device contains advantageously a collection of URL addresses of known services.<sup>9</sup>

**B. Nykanen fails to disclose a method for sharing content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device**

As noted above, Nykanen discloses a method for establishing data transmission between two devices, but fails to disclose a method for sharing content transmitted from a wireless device. Embodiments of the invention extend the concept of facilitating data transmission between two communication devices well past what is disclosed in Nykanen by providing a method for storing and sharing content transmitted from a device. In other words, embodiments of the invention pick up where Nykanen leaves off: Nykanen discloses how to establish a connection and obtain data/content via a WAP device, while embodiments of the invention teach how to then easily share that data/content with another device.

---

<sup>8</sup> Nykanen, column 3, lines 9-13.

<sup>9</sup> Id. Column 8, lines 9-24.



**C. Claim 19: Nykanen fails to show each and every element of the claim, and cannot, therefore, anticipate the claimed invention**

Claim 19 is a method for transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, comprising:

- receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the device;
- receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL;
- generating a message including an indication of a second URL, a file associated with the second URL including a modified version of the content corresponding to the first URL; and
- transmitting the message to the destination address.

Nykanen does not show each and every element of claim 19. In fact, Nykanen is only similar to the claimed invention in that it discloses a URL being accessed by a WAP enabled device. Nykanen does not show "receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the device." Furthermore, Nykanen does not show "receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL," nor "generating a message including an indication of a second URL, a file associated with the second URL including a modified version of the content corresponding to the first URL." Finally, Nykanen does not show transmitting the message to the destination address."

The Examiner refers to column 8, lines 9-24 and column 12, lines 25-31 as evidence of Nykanen's alleged anticipation of claim 19. However, it is clear that these passages do not disclose each and every element of the claim. As cited and discussed above, Nykanen discloses, at lines 9-13: "For retrieving information via the communication network, the communication device needs a WML browser and a HTTP WWW server coupled to the communication network, whereby the browser transmits a request to the selected server for retrieving the desired information, which is identified with the URL address." Claim 19 does at least recite a "first URL that is accessed by the device."

Nykanen continues, at lines 14-18: "This information is given e.g. in the WML language which can be compared with the HTML language. After obtaining the information, it is possibly subjected to WML/HTML conversion and presented to the user by means of the application used." Nykanen is still discussing information related to the retrieved URL, or, in the comparison with claim 19, the "first URL." The passage referred to by the Examiner concludes at lines 19-24 as follows: "Usually, also the URL addresses stored in the URL register of the communication device can refer to local services, such as teleVAS functions of the device itself, or to remote services, such as information of a server in the WML form. The URL register of the device contains advantageously a collection of URL addresses of known services." Nykanen is discussing content related to the retrieved URL. Nykanen, however, is not discussing "receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL," or "generating a message including an indication of a second URL, a file associated with the second URL including a modified version of the content corresponding to the first URL," or "transmitting the message to the destination address," which are elements of claim 19.

In other words, Nykanen clearly does not mention the sharing of content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device. At best, Nykanen is relevant only in that it discloses a WAP device obtaining content from a server. Therefore Nykanen, at least within column 8, lines 9-24, does not teach each and every element of claim 19.

The Examiner also uses column 12, lines 25-31 of Nykanen in supporting her determination of anticipation. Again, it is clear these passages also do not teach each and every element of claim 19, nor provide the elements lacking in the previously discussed passage. Like the earlier passage, Nykanen merely discloses that their system enables WAP access, and, if anything, is less relevant than the earlier discussed passage. Therefore Nykanen, at least within column 12, lines 25-31, does not teach each and every element of claim 19.

Thus, claim 19 is patentable over Nykanen.

**D. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)****1. Legal requirements for obviousness**

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) provides:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

As stated in section 2142 of the MPEP, "to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." *In re Vick*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rockier*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (citing *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 782, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). "[T]he [E]xaminer bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness." *Id.* at 1532.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must (a) identify prior art references that disclose all the elements of the claims, and (b) provide a suggestion or motivation to modify the references to produce the claimed invention. MPEP § 2143. With respect to the second requirement, the Examiner must provide a suggestion or motivation

to combine from within the prior art, and may not rely upon hindsight gleaned from applicants' invention itself. See, e.g., *Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 837 F.2d 1044, 1050-51, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Furthermore, "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

2. The applied references

a. *The Nykanen reference*

As discussed in detail above, Nykanen is directed to a method for setting up a data transmission connection between two devices. The connection is formed in order to transmit information from one device to a second device. Nykanen explains that "the purpose of the invention is particularly to define a system for communication between a WAP server and a WAP client..."<sup>10</sup>

b. *The Darago et al. Reference*

Darago is directed to computer architecture for managing courseware in a shared use operating environment. Darago explains that "the present invention is concerned with network-based courseware delivery systems."<sup>11</sup> Darago further explains that "the architecture of the present invention provides improved security, efficiency, and convenience for the management of courseware or other content in a shared operating environment such as a network or a collection of loosely coupled networks."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Nykanen, column 3, lines 9-13.

<sup>11</sup> Darago, column 2, lines 55-56.

<sup>12</sup> Id., column 6, lines 60-63.

For example, the system of Darago is implemented as a networked courseware delivery system that provides a content server which may contain courseware and other managed content that can be accessed by users (such as students) of the system.<sup>13</sup> In order to provide this capability, the system "operates in a network containing a registration server, a content server connected to the registration server, and several client workstations connected to the content server."<sup>14</sup> Users may then register with the system via the registration server. The content server then authenticates users. After authentication, the content server provides content to the user at a client workstation.<sup>15</sup> Darago does not discuss mobile or cellular phones.

*c. The Osaku Reference*

Osaku is directed to a method and system for accessing information on a network using message aliasing functions having shadow callback functions. As Osaku explains, "the present invention provides novel methods and systems for accessing a network URL through pre-assigned, simplified network addresses, often using a single number of one or more digits, and for then displaying the home page corresponding to the simplified network address."<sup>16</sup>

**E. The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case for obviousness**

Under the above standards, applicants' invention would not have been obvious for lack of *prima facie* case. For at least the reasons described in greater detail below, the Examiner has failed to satisfy her burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Examiner has not identified prior art references that disclose all the elements of the pending claims. For example, several pending claims include, *inter alia*, the feature of sharing data/content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device. As

---

<sup>13</sup> Id., Figures 3-4.

<sup>14</sup> Id., column 6, lines 1-4.

<sup>15</sup> Id., column 6, lines 1-14 and Figure 1.

explained in greater detail below, none of the cited references teach or suggest this feature. Possibly more importantly, the Examiner has not provided sufficient or cogent motivation from within the prior art to modify the cited references to produce the claimed invention. For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case has not been established, and the pending claims should be allowed.

**F. Claims 1-18 and 20-42: Nykanen, Darago et al. and Osaku fail to disclose the sharing of content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device**

As noted above, Nykanen discloses how to establish a connection and obtain data/content via a WAP device, but does not disclose the sharing of the data/content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device.

Darago fails to make up for the deficiencies of Nykanen. For the purposes of this discussion, Darago merely shows a shared use operating environment where different client workstations are able to access the same content at a content server. Darago simply fails to provide any discussion of sharing content between a WAP/i-mode-enabled device and another device.

Osaku, likewise, simply fails to provide any discussion of sharing content between a WAP/i-mode-enabled device and another device, as Osaku is directed to accessing URLs using simplified addresses.

Thus, Nykanen, Darago and Osaku fail to disclose (or fairly suggest) any method of sharing content between devices, which is a thrust of claims 1-18 and 20-42. Claims 1-8 and 15-18 are directed to methods of sharing content between two WAP/i-mode-enabled devices. Claims 20-39 are directed to methods of transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device. Claims 40-42 are directed to computer-readable media whose contents cause a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to initiate transmission of content from the

---

<sup>16</sup> Osaku, column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 2.

device to a destination. Thus, claims 1-18 and 20-42 are patentable because Nykanen, Darago and Osaku fail to disclose or fairly suggest a system or method of sharing content between a WAP/i-mode-enabled device and another device.

Furthermore, The Examiner has not provided a suggestion or motivation to modify the references to produce the invention as recited in claims 1-18 and 20-42. For example, in order to combine Nykanen with Darago, the Examiner states "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Darago into the computer system of Nykanen to have the message can be used to access device associated with the destination address because it would have an utilization and convenient communications system that can use or enjoy something in one possesses."<sup>17</sup> As best the applicant can tell, the Examiner is relying on Darago's disclosure of sharing content as the reason for combining the two references.

Nykanen, however, does not discuss the sharing of content between mobile devices. Instead, "the "purpose of [Nykanen] is particularly to define a system for communication between a WAP server and a WAP client complying with the WAP application protocol in the area of a piconet utilising IR or SPRF services and utilising this piconet."<sup>18</sup> Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Darago's system of computer architecture for managing courseware in a shared use operating environment.

Additionally, because Darago is directed to computer architecture to manage courseware, it can not be considered analogous art. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that Darago would have commended itself to Nykanen in considering his problem. Therefore, the combination of Nykanen and Darago is impermissible as (1) the Examiner does not provide a suggestion or motivation to combine from within the prior art and (2) the cited references are not analogous art.

---

<sup>17</sup> July 27, 2005 Office Action, page 4.

<sup>18</sup> Nykanen, column 3, lines 10-15.

1. Claims 1-18 and 20-42: Nykanen and Darago et al. fail to disclose a method for transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to another device.

Claims 1-18 and 20-42 are taken as a group.<sup>19</sup>

Claim 1 is directed to a method for transmitting content, or information related to the content, from a first WAP/i-mode-enabled device to a second WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the method comprising "receiving a command from a first WAP/i-mode enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the first device...receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL...generating a message including an indication of [a] second URL, wherein the second URL corresponds to content received by the first device, and transmitting the message to the destination address."

As discussed above, Nykanen discloses how to establish a connection and obtain data/content (such as content accessed through a URL) via a WAP device. Nykanen, however, does not disclose or suggest a WAP device sharing the obtained content with another WAP device. Specifically, Nykanen does not disclose or suggest sharing content between WAP/i-mode-enabled devices by "receiving a command" for transmission of a URL, "receiving a destination address," "generating a message," or "transmitting the message to the destination address" as is recited in claim 1.

Darago also does not provide these elements. As noted above, Darago discloses a network architecture where multiple client workstations are able to access the same content contained on a content server within the network. Darago, therefore, also does not disclose or suggest sharing content between WAP/i-mode-enabled devices by "receiving a

---

<sup>19</sup> The applicant has grouped the claims to simplify issues on appeal. The applicant, however, does not admit that the claims in any group stand or fall together for purposes other than this appeal. In particular, the applicant reserves the right to argue the patentability of each claim separately in a subsequent action, such as reopened prosecution or litigation.



command" for transmission of a URL, "receiving a destination address," generating a message," or "transmitting the message to the destination address" as is recited in claim 1.

The combination of Nykanen and Darago does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is patentable over Nykanen and Darago. The remaining claims in this group are patentable for similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-18 include all the limitations of independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 20 is similar to claim 1, but is directed to a method for transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device to a destination address. Dependent claims 21-29 include all the limitations of independent claim 20, and are thus patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 30 includes limitations similar to those described above with respect to claims 1 and 20, including elements directed to storing the content before transmitting the message to the destination address, and is thus similarly patentable. Claims 31-39 are dependent on claim 30 and are thus similarly patentable.

Claims 40-42 are directed to computer readable media and include limitations similar to those described above with respect to claims 1, 20 and 30, and are this similarly patentable.

In sum, claims 1-18 and 20-42 are patentable because Nykanen and Darago at least fail to disclose (or fairly suggest) the sharing of content between a WAP/i-mode-enabled device and another device or destination address.

Furthermore, as discussed above, claims 1-18 and 20-42 are likewise patentable because the Examiner does not provide a suggestion or motivation to combine the two references from within the prior art. Instead, the Examiner relies on her own opinion that "[a] utilization and convenient communications system that can use or enjoy something in

one possesses" would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nykanen with Darago.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 364388075US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Smith  
Registration No.: 56,702  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-3090  
(206) 359-4090 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant

APPENDIX A

**Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/801,635**

1. A method for transmitting content, or information related to the content, from a first WAP/i-mode-enabled device to a second WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the method comprising:
  - receiving a command from a first WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the first device, wherein the first device has received content associated by the first URL;
  - receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL, wherein the destination address is associated with the second device;
  - generating a message including an indication of the second URL, wherein the second URL corresponds to the content received by the first device; and
  - transmitting the message to the destination address, wherein the message can be used to access the content by the second device associated with the destination address.
2. The method of claim 1 wherein the first URL and the second URL are identical.
3. The method of claim 1 wherein the command includes an invoking script call containing the first URL as an argument.
4. The method of claim 1 wherein the indication is a pointer to the second URL, and a file associated with the second URL includes a pointer to the first URL.
5. The method of claim 4 wherein the file associated with the second URL contains advertising.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein the indication is a pointer to the second URL.
7. The method of claim 1 wherein the indication includes the second URL.
8. The method of claim 1 wherein the first URL is currently-accessed by the WAP/i-mode-enabled device.
9. The method of claim 1 wherein the content corresponding to the first URL is cached.
10. The method of claim 9 wherein a file corresponding to the second URL includes the cached content.
11. The method of claim 9 wherein a file corresponding to the second URL includes a modified version of the cached content.
12. The method of claim 11 wherein the modified version of the cached content includes advertising.
13. The method of claim 11 wherein the modified version of the cached content is in a format capable of being rendered on a destination device at the destination address.
14. The method of claim 13 wherein the format for the modified version of the cached content is selected based on the destination device.
15. The method of claim 1 wherein the first URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a history stack prior to the receiving of the command.
16. The method of claim 1 wherein the first URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a list of bookmarks prior to the receiving of the command.

17. The method of claim 1 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is WAP-enabled, but not i-mode-enabled.

18. The method of claim 1 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is i-mode-enabled, but not WAP-enabled.

19. A method for transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the method comprising:

- receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the device;
- receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL;
- generating a message including an indication of a second URL, a file associated with the second URL including a modified version of the content corresponding to the first URL; and
- transmitting the message to the destination address.

20. A method for transmitting content from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the method comprising:

- receiving a first URL from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device in a command including an invoking script call;
- receiving a destination address for transmission of the first URL;
- generating a message including a pointer to a second URL, wherein the pointer, second URL, or both relate to data accessible via the first URL; and
- transmitting the message to the destination address to permit a device associated with the second address to access the data.

21. The method of claim 20 wherein the first URL and the second URL are identical.

22. The method of claim 20 wherein a file associated with the second URL contains a pointer to the first URL.
23. The method of claim 20 wherein a file associated with the second URL contains advertising.
24. The method of claim 20 wherein a file associated with the second URL contains a modified version of the content corresponding to the first URL.
25. The method of claim 24 wherein the modified version of the content is in a format suitable for rendering on a destination device at the destination address.
26. The method of claim 20 wherein the first URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a history stack prior to the receiving of the command.
27. The method of claim 20 wherein the first URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a list of bookmarks prior to the receiving of the command.
28. The method of claim 20 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is WAP-enabled, but not i-mode-enabled.
29. The method of claim 20 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is i-mode-enabled, but not WAP-enabled.
30. A method for transmitting content, or information related to the content, from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the method comprising:
- receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of content corresponding to a URL;
  - receiving a destination address for transmission of the content;

storing the content for subsequent retrieval;  
generating a message including the content; and  
transmitting the message to the destination address, without any required pre-processing of the content or the URL to enable the transmission.

31. The method of claim 30 wherein the content includes advertising inserted by an application server.

32. The method of claim 30 wherein the content is translated into a format different from the format of the content rendered on the WAP/i-mode-enabled device, before inclusion of the content into the message.

33. The method of claim 32 wherein the format into which the content is translated can be properly rendered by a destination device at the destination address.

34. The method of claim 33 wherein the format into which the content is translated is selected based on the destination device at the destination address.

35. The method of claim 34 wherein the format into which the content is translated is selected based on a connection with the destination device at the destination address.

36. The method of claim 30 wherein the URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a history stack prior to the receiving of the command.

37. The method of claim 30 wherein the URL is a previously-accessed URL and is retrieved from a list of bookmarks prior to the receiving of the command.

38. The method of claim 30 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is WAP-enabled, but not i-mode-enabled.

39. The method of claim 30 wherein the WAP/i-mode-enabled device is a device that is i-mode-enabled, but not WAP-enabled.

40. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions, which when executed, initiate the transmission of content, or information related to the content, from a first WAP/i-mode-enabled telecommunications device to a second telecommunications device, the instructions including:

- receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device that a URL accessed by the device will be transmitted, wherein the URL corresponds to content the first WAP/i-mode-enabled telecommunications device wishes to share with the second telecommunications device;

- receiving a destination address for transmission of the URL to the second telecommunications device, wherein the destination address is associated with the second telecommunications device;

- generating a message including an indication of the URL; and

- transmitting the message to the destination address, wherein the message can be used to access the content by the second telecommunications device.

41. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions, which when executed, initiate the transmission of content, or information related to the content, from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the instructions including:

- receiving a command from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device for transmission of a first URL that is accessed by the device, wherein the URL corresponds to content accessed by the device;

- receiving a destination address for transmission of the content or the first URL;



storing the content, or revised version of the content, for subsequent retrieval;

generating a message including an indication of a second URL, or pointer, to the content; and

transmitting the message to the destination address to permit a device associated with the destination address to access the stored content.

42. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions, which when executed, initiate the transmission of content, or information related to the content, from a WAP/i-mode-enabled device, the instructions including:

receiving a command from a WAP and i-mode-enabled device, or just i-mode enabled device, for transmission of content associated with a URL that is accessed by the device;

receiving a destination address for transmission of the URL or the content corresponding to the URL;

storing the content, or modified version of the content, for subsequent retrieval;

generating a message including the content, or modified version of the content, corresponding to the URL; and

transmitting the message to the destination address.

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

No evidence has been entered or is being relied upon in the present appeal.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

There are no decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section.